

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF
COLUMBUS DAY AS A NATIONAL
HOLIDAY

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 9, 1972

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, at a time when man is confronted by challenges from all sides, at a time when terrible tensions and divisions cover the face of our world, at a time when the dreaded enemies of poverty, ignorance and disease continue to threaten our very survival, at a time when the cries of the oppressed are answered only by silence, a resurgence of the Columbian spirit which stirred that Genoese navigator ever onward on his quest for a new world, is a most vital need.

Today, as we focus our attention on the achievements of Christopher Columbus, we honor not only the man and his attainments, but we recognize clearly and deeply that tenacity, that spirit, the indomitable will, that firm belief in the integrity and ability of man—those qualities possessed by Columbus which truly carried him forward to the successful completion of his great voyage. For with his indestructible faith, his penetrating vision, and his unyielding determination, Christopher Columbus conquered the myth and mystery of this time and solved the terrifying riddle of the Atlantic.

Although Columbus' undertaking has become tinged in our minds with the romantic glamor of a child's adventuring, the immensity of that ocean and its tragic awe can hardly be conceivable to us now. Broad as it was, it seemed the more eerie for the horrors with which men's superstitions peopled it. The known and the unknown mingled together in picturesque confusion. Each kernel of truth was clouded by a covering of misinterpretation, poor communication and unjustified fear. How clearly can one picture those three wooden ships, guided only by the crudest of navigational instruments, so pitifully frail and ill-suited to the unknown and hazardous challenges that lay ahead. How easily can we identify with the seemingly endless days of sailing on an ocean where no ship had ventured before, the dashed hopes when cries that land had been sighted proved false, or the near mutiny of the impatient, frightened seamen.

We remember Columbus as a man who fought tenaciously and suffered terribly because he wanted to find the truth and make it triumph. We regard him as a great pioneer personifying the spirit of discovery, and embodying the will to overcome insurmountable odds. Columbus' fleet may have found its port but the journey which he began has not yet been completed. For it was through Columbus' voyage that a pattern was established for a nation of many nationalities, traits, and beliefs, and it was through this voy-

age that men looked upon this land as a place where all people, regardless of color, creed, or how humble or exalted their origin, could achieve their full potential. And, as we become ever more conscious of the importance of our historic roots in both understanding the founding concepts on which our country stands, and the needs and demands of the present as well as future generations, the importance of Columbus as the father of immigration takes on added significance.

Though dedicated to egalitarian ideas, we have fallen short of the goals we have established. At times our actions have failed to mirror our intentions. The legacy of this Nation—of Montesquieu and Locke and Jefferson—the foundation of sovereignty and democracy, are our rich heritage; this is a time in our history of continued dedication and effort to reach these goals. The challenge of discovery, of invention, of exploration continues to kindle in our hearts. From the crucial clues to the causes of our fatal diseases, to the complicated answer to the problem of crime in our streets, to the myriad of perplexing problems confronting us today, this is a time for renewing our struggle to improve the quality of life, to seek opportunities not unlike those sought by our immigrants, and to search for betterment in all aspects of society. Just as in Columbus' day, the challenges lie before us. As author of the bill which designated Columbus Day as a national holiday to be commemorated by all Americans, I strongly feel that it is most appropriate we look upon Columbus Day, 1972, as a day to rededicate ourselves toward a voyage of peace, justice, and freedom for all men.

THE FUTURE OF AIR
TRANSPORTATION

HON. NORRIS COTTON

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 9, 1972

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, on September 11, 1972, Mr. John H. Shaffer, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, spoke before the Comstock Club in Sacramento, Calif. Mr. Shaffer's remarks concerned various aspects of the future of our national air transportation system.

I find his address to be an informative statement of the prospects of our civil aviation system in meeting the rapidly increasing demand for air services. I note with particular interest Mr. Shaffer's recognition of the need that rural parts of this country have for air transportation.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Shaffer's remarks be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY JOHN H. SHAFFER

In the pioneering days of aviation, the best planes of the air transport companies—open cockpit DH-4's, the Lincoln-Pages and so forth—were hard put to carry as many as two passengers. Later the "giant" Ford Trimotors could carry ten passengers and a little cargo at speeds sometimes approaching 135 miles per hour. Today, the luster of those aeronautical achievements is dull, overshadowed by the spectacular performance of jet transports capable of carrying upwards of 300 passengers in luxurious comfort and safety at velocities nudging the speed of sound.

When America came home from World War I, she did so imbued with the potential of the third dimension of transportation—aviation—with its promise of speedy delivery of mail, cargo and people from one place to another. This seemed reasonable to the United States Congress and, in its fiscal year 1918 budget, the post office was allocated \$100,000 for air mail experiments and was further authorized to charge 24 cents per half-ounce for air mail. That department, of course, was enthusiastic and envisioned routes from the west coast to the east coast and, in addition, various routes in Alaska. The idea was that airplanes could and would deliver the mail anywhere that it couldn't be delivered by ground transportation. The plan was excellent.

Unfortunately, airplanes in those days couldn't fly very well, very far, or very reliably. So, in the beginning a New York to Washington run was decided upon with revenues envisioned at about \$3,800 a trip for about 500 pounds of mail per plane per trip. However, the enthusiasm was largely academic, because the mail that turned up for aerial delivery that first day, and for some time to come, could have been carried in the pilot's helmet.

But it was a beginning.

Air transportation, like the transcontinental railroads, would have been too long delayed in making its now impressive contribution to America's social, cultural, and economic well-being had the government not been willing to assist the fledgling aviation and airline industries during those pioneering days.

In the case of rail transportation, our early American statesmen recognized that our country must have an adequate network of rail transportation. They also realized that with the limited traffic available then and in the early years ahead, railroad enterprise could not attract enough capital to get the job done. So the Government aided in the development of a rail system by offering direct assistance, in the form of subsidy, to the companies which could build and operate the railroads.

The Government program worked out well. The United States, today, has the largest railroad network in the world. And, of course, there did come a time when the railroads became self-sustaining and direct Government subsidy was eliminated.

A later generation of statesmen saw the need to use the airplane as a vehicle of transportation. In general, these statesmen applied the same practice of assistance to the fledgling airlines as had been granted to the railroads.

To the students of business enterprise, and to the students of government policy, the subject of subsidy, of course, has always been both interesting and controversial. One of the basic criteria of the private enterprise system is that the risks of business will be borne by the private investor. He is entitled

to the profits of the business if there is success, but he is also expected to pay for those losses if earlier hopes cannot be realized.

The merit of this system is that it impartially prunes the weak limbs, leaving the harder stock a better chance to develop a strong structure.

Historically, and undoubtedly for years to come, the long-range effects of subsidy, in any form and for any purpose, will remain in controversy. Its pros and cons have no purpose here. Yet the fact remains that in the early days subsidy, in the form of air mail contracts, did breathe the financial stability into the nation's airlines.

At the end of World War II, the cost of property and equipment operated by the airlines was about \$125 million. By the end of 1955, this investment had multiplied ten times to \$1.4 billion.

By 1965 it was \$5 billion and the six years subsequent, at year end 1971, the cost of airline property and equipment represented an investment of more than \$13 billion.

The point of this financial recitation is that air transport has become a vital force in the economic life of the nation domestically and internationally. Today, civil aviation is the leading mode of intercity public transport, serving almost twice the passenger miles of the combination of all other modes—rail, bus and water. Today, Americans are turning to air travel at the rate of more than 9,000 new passenger fares per day—more passengers in one day than traveled by air during the entire year of 1927.

Last year, the nation's airlines carried 173 million passengers while private, business, and corporate aircraft of the Nation's general aviation fleet accounted for the intercity movement of another 50 million. Ten years from now the FAA is predicting and, I believe, conservatively, our scheduled airlines will be carrying upward of 600 million annually and our general aviation fleet will be moving some 150 million passengers on an annual basis. Some 2 million Americans will be airborne every day of the year.

Obviously, these growth factors indicate an industry requirement for large capacity, long-range, fast aircraft.

Today, the Boeing 747, whose powerful engines speak softly but carry a big ship, is not only the Nation's largest commercial air transport but it operates at cruise speeds comparable to all other subsonic jet aircraft.

The Boeing Co. has already announced plans to increase the passenger capacity of the 747 to accommodate more than twice today's number of passengers by 1980. This reconfiguration, incidentally, is well within the capability of the present airframe and calls for neither reduction in speed nor range. To the airlines, this increase in passenger capacity would result in a substantial reduction of direct operating costs, per seat mile, while simultaneously offering the potential for an increased return on investment.

To the fare-paying passenger of the eighties, reduced fares between major U.S. hubs and to and from world capitals is a distinct possibility.

Projecting present research and development, however, suggests that future aircraft will become more specialized for their commercial mission. Each aircraft type will and must be designed to specific markets. This suggests to me that air transport operations tomorrow will almost surely be separated into two divisions—long haul and short haul.

The passenger aircraft fleet already has a variety of large wide-bodied aircraft, Lockheed L-1011, McDonnell-Douglas DC-10, and Boeing 747's.

Present estimates of projected growth in the size of aircraft operating between major

hubs by 1990, for example, suggest a four-times growth in average capacity. The implications of this trend are that the doubling of the air traffic demand every ten years, which has been the case, can essentially be accommodated by increasing airplane size without significant increases in the numbers of operations (arrivals and departures).

In the ideal sense, this is true. But with it, the air transport system becomes less flexible. It reckons without the growing dependence of less populated points and rural America, too, upon air transport. And in the development of an all pervasive arterial network of air transport effectively linked to surface and rail transport systems, the demand of small cities and rural connective points must also be equated.

Indeed commuter, local service carrier, and air taxi movements are now dramatically increasing and are indicative of the public demand for short-haul aircraft. The steady migration of industry to rural and suburban America lends additional emphasis to the efficacy of the requirement for two divisional and transport operations and, in this case, the need for short-haul jet-powered aircraft. This suggests that a family of two, three-, and four-engined short-haul transports must come into being to supplement and complement the long haul fleet.

Today, between 40 and 50 per cent of the Nation's air travel requirement is for airlift distances of 500 miles or less.

And as commuter air travel statistics indicate, demand for airlift between city pairs separated by distances of less than 250 miles is rapidly climbing. In this regard, the use of short takeoff and landing (STOL) aircraft for short distances has been proposed repeatedly. The technologies to operate off shorter runways exist today and plans for modification of current aircraft to lower air speeds and shortened runways are ongoing.

I am of the persuasion that most airline operators are coming to the same conclusion, that it will be STOL and VTOL categories which will become the effective means of intra-urban and short haul inter-urban air travel in the decades of the eighties and nineties.

General design characteristics for a family of urban area STOL and VTOL aircraft serving various transport and utility requirements will include, small to medium passenger capacity, low cruise speeds, low noise level, specialized operational capability, and low cost. The potential need and markets for both types of aircraft are obvious. To the communities served by short takeoff or vertical takeoff aircraft, there would accrue added service without added congestion and excessive cost.

To the customer, the passenger, both offer convenience, time saving, and completely flexible service. To the airline operator, the attractions are relatively simple airport facilities, certainly less costly and, of course, very flexible operations. Of particular significance to a national public increasingly preoccupied with the elimination of the sounds of aviation in the airport vicinity, both STOL and VTOL categories become most attractive. The use of either, in large part, would restrict objectionable noise to within the airport perimeter.

The subject of industrial noise, aircraft engine noise and smoke emissions in particular, have become cases of controversy and debate.

But the temptation to cast technology in the role of the ecological villain must be resisted—for to do so is to deprive ourselves of a vital tool available for enhancing environmental quality. The difficulties which some applications of technology have engendered might be rectified by technological curfews—turning our backs on the 20th century, but only at a price in privation which we do not want to pay and there's no need to pay. Technology can and must be wisely

applied so that it becomes environmentally self-corrective. This is precisely the prescription of our research effort at the Federal aviation administration.

We have undertaken steps to insure that the remarkable amount of technology which we have acquired during the past quarter-century of aviation's fabulous growth will be used to solve our aeronautical environmental problems, as opposed to creating new ones. FAA's environmental research programs are concentrated on two fronts—air and noise pollution. As a matter of fact, the FAA was among the first Federal agencies to demonstrate its concern for environmental quality with the establishment of our office of noise abatement in 1966. Late last year, we expanded the responsibilities of this office and restructured it as the office of environmental quality. It has the overall responsibility of developing policies and procedures aimed at the reduction or elimination of aircraft noise, smoke emission, exhaust pollution, and aircraft waste programs.

It is also spearheading a cooperative government and industry-wide program to handle the broad spectrum of environmental challenges facing aviation today as well as ones which may be on the horizon.

Today, work is moving rapidly ahead on quiet engine technology. In fact, we hope to demonstrate, by 1974, a new jet engine about one-half as noisy as the present conventional jet engine but without major performance penalties. Indeed, I am confident that by 1980, environmental problems of sound and smoke emissions on all new production aircraft will no longer constitute a problem of any significance to any American community. So the ills that aviation has created are being corrected and rapidly.

This, government and industry teamwork has done. Federal Aviation regulation No. 36 imposed a lid on aviation sound. All of the airplanes that have been built in America since that rule went into effect have been quieter than the law has demanded. Research and engineering have brought the sound of aviation down to acceptable levels but we're not resting on our laurels. The 747, the DC-10 the L-1011 transports, all new production aircraft since FAR 36 went into effect, are "good citizens" in every sense of the environmental laws of the land. But I can tell you, the next generation will be quieter still. And further along the road of aviation progress, when we build our supersonic transport, as one day we must, it, too, will meet the noise standards of the same FAR regulations to which our current production large air transports are subjected.

Consistent with man's inherent desire to travel further in less time, the development of an American supersonic transport is inevitable in the decade of the eighties. And for the decade of the nineties, hydrogen powered hypersonic transports, and nuclear powered cargo transports are among air transport proposals currently under discussion. Both questions of safety and logistics to support these aircraft are under study, for the potential for a transport aircraft with essentially unlimited range and order-of-magnitude increases in efficiency approaches the panacea for airline operator and user alike.

But withal, the air system of the United States should be viewed as a valuable but a limited resource. It is a resource that has an important role as a public service system. But our airways are congesting. Today there are about 2,400 aircraft in the scheduled airline fleet and 133,000 private, corporate and business aircraft comprising the general aviation fleet. Within the next ten years the scheduled fleet will increase by approximately 20 percent in numbers, but our general aviation fleet will double to approximately 230,000 aircraft.

Electronic systems and automated computerized equipment, procedures and tech-

niques required to handle air traffic control in the decade ahead are considered to be "present state of the art" and no difficulties technically or by way of timely acquisition are anticipated.

For the latter, timely acquisition, the aviation community, the airlines and their using public can thank President Nixon. Until the enactment of the landmark Airport/Airway Development Act of 1970, sponsored by the administration and passed in a bi-partisan Congress, the FAA could ill-afford consideration of any aeronautical matter not directly associated with the safety of flight. The near five-and-one-half billion dollars authorized for expenditure by the FAA, in combination with matching funds from the private sector, now permits the FAA to oversee the outlay of well over \$11 billion in this decade for improvement and expansion of our airports and airways.

Nevertheless, critical difficulties are arising in the orderly flow of air travelers and air traffic because airport development and associated ground transportation facilities have lagged aircraft development. As the 747's, DC-10's and L-1011's join airline fleets in ever increasing numbers, ground delays and congestion seem inevitable specters. A number of factors underlie the situation none of which, fortunately, are incapable of solution as public awareness of the problem increases.

For one thing, until passage of the Airport/Airways Development Act, Federal involvement in civil airports was directed primarily toward the air side and public safety.

A dearth of funds allocated by Government prior to that time in behalf of a burgeoning national aviation system precluded definitive focus on other aviation matters. Indeed, it is only because of President Nixon's insistence that our Nation must have a balanced transportation system, that the FAA will expend more money in this decade in modernizing the aviation system than had been previously invested by Government in the past 40 years.

While crux of the problem may have been the lack of a total system approach to airport planning and development during the sixties, the point is, what are the solutions?

FAA studies indicate that the solution lies in the development of secondary airports serving short-haul routes with, as I mentioned earlier, suitable aircraft designed specifically to reduce the load at the most congested large hub airports. There is little doubt in my mind that the day is approaching, and faster than most think, when the large jet transport can serve only the major urban complexes. And conversely, short-haul STOL and VTOL transports, operating from secondary airports will serve short haul markets. Transcontinental, or long distance service from major hub to major hub must eventually be just that. Passenger service fanning out from our large centeroids to less populated and rural areas must soon be relegated to short haul aircraft designed specifically for this market.

Today, the demand for mobility, the flexible, efficient and rapid mobility that only aviation can provide, is reshaping national communities. Hawaii, for example, relies primarily on air to deliver the tourists which are the State's major economy. It is safe, therefore, to assume that higher speed aircraft will expand the opportunity for urban development in other remote locations highly suited for recreational or resource development, but which have not been previously developed because of "inaccessibility."

Undoubtedly, air cities will emerge that are dependent upon the extraction and processing of natural resources.

The activity created by the oil discoveries on the North Slope of Alaska reached the intensity that it did because of air accessibility. To provide opportunities for more of these types of development means that air

facilities must be developed in locations which are on the threshold of development.

Airports are the nuclei of the national air transportation system. Airports provide the facilities which give cities, industrial complexes, and small communities alike instant access to national and international markets. But planning considerations for airports are numerous and complex. Yet few systems engineering approaches have been developed thus far to assist in the planning and development of the vast new airport modernization programs which must be undertaken in the next few years.

The location of airports cannot be determined without extensive analysis of road, rail, and air alternatives. Tradeoff between proximity to population centers and time savings to be gained through effective high-speed ground transportation and other airport access methods, systems and techniques are in themselves complex. Further, these analyses must be complemented by an equally systematic approach to the many social, environmental, and financial problems involved.

In order to meet future demand for air system services, some elements of the air system will undergo major transformations in the public interest. In other cases, the tune-up of the existing air transport facilities will be sufficient. In either instance, users of our vastly expanding national aviation system will benefit.

In closing, I would like to remind all of us that the one real threat to stable growth and security of America's, indeed the world's civil aviation system and the safety of the travelling public, has been the increasing variety of unlawful acts endangering the public safety. But we intend and are determined to bring crimes against aircraft and airports such as hijackings, extortions, bomb threats, vandalism and thefts, to a halt, I believe that we now have a strangle hold on this menace to the public safety and the Nation's air transportation system. We have been working for the past year and a half with law enforcement agencies and airlines management to eliminate the threat of air piracy domestically and internationally through diplomatic channels.

We are encouraged by the intensifying actions of other governments to discourage hijackers with their immediate arrest upon landing on foreign soil. And we are pleased that stolen funds taken by extortionists, in almost all instances, have been immediately impounded and forthwith returned to the airline from which it was extorted. Sanctuaries are slowly being closed for no nation wants the mentally sick, the thief, or the terrorist. Soon air pirates will have no place to hide. Your government is pressing for wide adherence to anti-hijacking agreements and for continued international cooperation on other civil aviation security matters.

But to achieve our goal of total safety for those who fly, communities must take on their share of the burden. Community leaders must come to realize that their local airports are as deserving of local police protection as any other community resource. There is little doubt, I believe, to any of us that our airports are a community resource, culturally, socially, and economically and deserving therefore, of local police protection. By working together, we can keep our airports, our airplanes, and our air travellers safe.

We are on the threshold of the true air age with the most distant points of earth coming to be as accessible in time and dollars as is now our favorite week-end haunt.

Business and industry will similarly benefit with delivery of raw materials from "anywhere" overnight and shipment, of course, of manufactured goods in ample time to routinely meet any domestic or international

marketing demand. A vast and grand future because of air transportation lies before us.

Our future, America's future, our strength domestically and in international markets, all depend in great measure upon our developing all pervasive arterial network of airports and airways linking town to city, city to city, and coast to coast.

NIXON IN VIETNAM: RHETORIC VERSUS DEEDS

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 9, 1972

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, 11 months ago on this day I introduced into the Record a reprint of an article by retired Gen. Hugh Hester entitled "26 Disastrous Years." I would like to take this opportunity to introduce another article by General Hester outlining the history of our involvement in Indochina especially as it relates to the conduct of President Nixon. I commend the article to your attention:

[From the Los Angeles News Advocate, July 1-15, 1972]

NIXON IN VIETNAM: RHETORIC VERSUS DEEDS

(By Hugh B. Hester)

Every time Mr. Nixon repeats the word *peace*, as he did recently in Leningrad, the millions of us whose support gave him the small plurality which elected him president either weep or become ill, or both. We now know from sad experience that whenever he uses the word *peace*, he is preparing to unload, or is unloading now, untold additional thousands of tons of death and destruction upon the peasant people of Indochina.

By *peace*, the president obviously means *peace* for the big powers, such as China and Russia. But these can retaliate, if and when attacked, and this robs the word *peace*, of course, of any moral meaning. For the small and weak countries, the rhetoric has been and still is *peace*, but the deed is and always has been *war* or *surrender*, with exploitation following.

NOT A CIVIL WAR

In Indochina, Mr. Nixon has said in *deeds* what Charles V of Spain put in these words: "I would rather be king over a holy desert than rule over a heretical paradise." There can no longer be any doubt that the President would rather make a desert of the whole of Indochina than admit he has made a mistake. In order to do this, however, he has felt it necessary to convince the American people that the North Vietnamese rulers are the Devils and that he and his followers are the Saints. Through the clever use of massive false official propaganda and control of most of the mass communications media, he has been able to convince possibly a majority of Americans that he and his supporters have been defending the freedom, independence and right of self-determination for the Indochinese people.

Nothing, of course, could be further from the truth, as a few pertinent background facts will show. This has been an imperial war against the peasant people of Indochina *ab initio*: first by France, then Japan, France again, and now the US government. It has never been a civil war as claimed by successive Washington administrations.

GENEVA MEETING

The Truman administration reversed the Roosevelt plan for placing the Indochinese people under a United Nations trusteeship,

pending the establishment by the people of their own government. He first financed covertly the French government's war efforts to reimpose its control over the Indochinese people. In doing this, Mr. Truman violated the Atlantic Charter, which provided for self-determination of colonial people at the conclusion of WWII, and US government obligations under the United Nations Charter which forbade unilateral interference with this process. He aggravated these violations by openly financing France's colonial war in Indochina at the start of the Korean civil war, which he [Truman] immediately converted into a so-called UN war for the purpose of "containing Communism," a la USA.

Eisenhower gave the real reason for financing the French colonial war against the Indochinese people by the US government at the Governors' Conference, Seattle, Washington, August 4, 1953. In answer to a query from the floor, he stated in substance, "We want access to the resources of the area, which are vast (N.Y. Times, August 5, 1953)." When the French military forces were finally defeated at Dienbienphu, May 5, 1954, a conference of concerned governments and representatives of the colonial people convened at Geneva, Switzerland.

DIEM HAD NO POWER

In mid-July, all except the Eisenhower government verbally agreed to the immediate independence of Cambodia and Laos, but postponed the actual independence of the Vietnamese until general elections by secret ballot, under international supervision, could be held for the selection of rulers of all Vietnam; the date set was July, 1956. Pending these elections, Ho Chi Minh was designated the provisional ruler of Vietnam, north of the 17th parallel and Bao Dai, former emperor, now the French agent, was placed in charge of the area south of the 17th parallel. The Geneva Conference, however, specifically stated that the 17th parallel was a temporary and provisional arrangement, and under no condition should be considered a division of Vietnam. Eisenhower, while not verbally agreeing to the 1954 Geneva Conference agreement, stated his government would not interfere with the implementation of its provisions.

Presumably under the influence of his vice president, Richard M. Nixon, and his Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, both of whom bitterly opposed the agreements, Eisenhower repudiated his pledge, began the shipment of weapons and advisors to Saigon and replaced Bao Dai with his agent, Ngo Dinh Diem. All of these were in violation of the 1954 Geneva provisions as well as in violation of the US government obligations under the UN Charter. And the appointment of Diem as Eisenhower's special agent is believed to have been for the specific purpose of preventing the elections scheduled for July, 1956. At any rate, this was the result which could only have occurred with Eisenhower's approval, if not at his specific direction, for Diem had no power of his own.

NIXON FALSEHOODS

Whether France abdicated her responsibilities under the Geneva Conference for the rule of the southern part of Vietnam, or was thrown out by the Eisenhower administration, is immaterial for our purposes. For, under international law, the power which succeeds another in due course becomes responsible for the international obligations of its predecessor. No native Vietnamese group, according to a recent report of the Nixon administration Secretary of State, William Rogers, ever invited any Washington administration to intervene in its internal affairs.

This clearly fixes the status of Diem as an Eisenhower administration agent. The responsibility for the failure to hold the election in 1956 as scheduled is, therefore, that of the principal, the Eisenhower administration, not its agent. This fact clearly released Ho Chi Minh and his followers from

their obligations under the 1954 Geneva Accords and made legal any effort on their part, including military, to unite their nation. The *ipso facto* made the Eisenhower administration the aggressor and successor to colonial France. The primary purpose for noting the above facts has been to prove false the Nixon administration claim that it is in Indochina, as were its predecessors, for the purpose of guaranteeing the right of the people of Indochina to self-determination, freedom and independence. *Quod Erat Demonstratum.*

NIXON "PEACE" FARCE

What then is the significance, if any, of the president's recent trips to China and to Russia, which has generated such great hopes for future peace? Will this euphoria prove synthetic as have the others such as the limited atomic test ban and non-proliferation of nuclear power? Certainly people of good will hope not, but let's take a look at the whole picture as well as the so-called agreements:

The US-Indochinese war has recently greatly increased in intensity. And there is no evidence that Mr. Nixon has reduced his irrational peace or even the savagery of his rhetorical attacks upon his opponents. This may prove a hopeful symptom at long last, however, since we live in an upsidedown world where truth means non-truth and so on.

Meanwhile, there is no solid evidence so far that China and Russia will decrease their aid to the Indochinese people, whom the Nixon administration calls enemies but most of the world does not, including millions of Americans. If the rulers of these countries want to do so, they can easily overcome the blockade of the North Vietnamese ports. China certainly can be expected to do so, for all of Indochina is a core interest of hers. In addition, she has committed herself to full support of its three states. This was not true to the same extent of China's relations with North Korea in the 1950's. Nevertheless, she intervened in order to protect her core interest, North Korea, when Truman sent MacArthur across the 38th parallel in the autumn of 1950. China will, in my opinion, intervene militarily if Mr. Nixon insists upon bombing northern Vietnam back to the stone age a la General LeMay, as now seems likely. If this happens, it will, of course, make a farce of the Kissinger-Nixon peace parade.

MUCH TO-DO ABOUT NOTHING

Russia, however, is a different matter. Indochina is not a core interest of hers, nor was or is North Korea. And it is important to note that she wrote off North Korea rather than directly confront a nuclear-armed United States in 1950. It was China which saved North Korea. Russia did, however, supply China when the latter intervened in what began as the Korean civil war. I predict Russia will again supply China, despite her ideological differences, if Mr. Nixon forces China to intervene as Truman did in 1950. Otherwise she would forfeit all claims of becoming a Communist state. Russia might just do this, however, but I hope and pray Mr. Nixon does not make a test case of it.

The foregoing is a brief summary of my views of successive Washington administration wars of aggression upon the Indochinese people, past and present, and a projection of what lies ahead under certain circumstances. But I want to reemphasize: it would be a great mistake, in my opinion, for those who have opposed this illegal and totally immoral war of aggression by successive Washington administration to conclude that Mr. Nixon's travels have radically changed this critical issue. The old French expression, "The more it changes, the more it remains the same," still applies as does the old caveat, "Why so much to-do about nothing?"

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

The agreements so far disclosed between the US and USSR do not even freeze "the

balance of terror." The nuclear stockpile is not being reduced. The agreement even includes provisions for certain increases in the stockpile. And when replacements with improved weapons, which are also permitted under the agreements, come into being the destructive power of the two big countries will be greatly increased. What has actually happened, it seems to me, is a ratification of the status quo by the two biggest powers in the hope that, between them, they can rule the world. If true, this is at least a recognition by them that neither can rule it alone. But this has been, or should have been, obvious to competent observers when the USSR launched the first Sputnik, Oct. 7, 1957.

But this will not bring world peace, unless there are extreme and radical changes in the behavior of the two big powers. Law and order, which are requisites of peace, depend upon justice. And neither of the biggest powers so far has shown any special aptitude for dispensing justice, either at home or abroad. Besides, justice is a complex concept. It means equal opportunity, not only for individuals but all kinds of institutions, customs and ideas necessary for the whole personality of peoples living in a complex, diversified world.

REVOLUTION INEVITABLE, UNLESS

International cooperation is still the challenge of our times. And the bi-polar concept of world rule is a move in the wrong direction. In an outlaw world such as now exists, two outlaw tribes are not going to be permitted to rule all the other tribes in their own special interests. Two dimensional thinking—we are good and they are evil—is clearly in control at the very top of the US government, and has been for many years, especially since WWII when Mr. Truman set forth on a global grab for world domination. And I suspect the top political rulers of the USSR are much the same.

Whether we like it or not, we live in one world, and we would be wise, it seems to me, to support and strengthen the United Nations so that it can eventually achieve the high purposes for which it was designed. We need fundamental and radical change at the top level in US government. And unless this can be achieved at an early date, revolution will become inevitable.

A PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO REQUIRE RECONFIRMATION OF FEDERAL JUDGES EVERY 8 YEARS

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 9, 1972

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, as more and more power is centralized in the Federal Government, we need to appraise more critically the justification for life appointment of Federal judges.

Judges who are accountable to no one are invading the sphere of the elected representatives of the people, handing down decisions which have great impact on the lives of the citizenry.

I fully support the concept of an independent judiciary. The constitutional amendment I have introduced, namely, Senate Joint Resolution 106, simply provides for a method by which the courts might be made more accountable to the people.

The facts show that 47 of the 50 States now have fixed tenure for their own judi-

ciaries. Only Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and New Hampshire still provide life tenure for State judges. So why should there be life tenure for Federal judges?

The Original 13 States began with life tenure for their judges, but gradually, through the years, all but three have changed that. All the new States that have entered the Union now have fixed tenure for their own judges. So I think the time has come to consider fixed tenure for Federal judges.

Why should any official in a democracy have lifetime tenure?

In the modern world, only kings, queens, emperors, maharajahs, and U.S. Federal judges hold office for life.

Mr. President, a committee hearing was held on this proposal, and I have found that there is more concern about life appointments for Federal judges than I had realized.

I find more interest on the part of the public. I was invited by the American Bar Association to address its recent annual meeting in San Francisco, its council of State presidents. I got a better reaction than I had anticipated.

Recently, I received additional encouragement in the form of a letter from the chief justice of the State of Indiana, Mr. Justice Norman F. Arterburn. After receiving this letter, I wrote to Chief Justice Arterburn, and thanked him for his communication, and said that, of course, I would regard it as confidential unless I was authorized to make it public. Since then, by additional correspondence, he has authorized that his letter, endorsing Senate Joint Resolution 106, be made public. I do make it public, because I think it has great significance. It is additional evidence that more and more jurists, more and more lawyers, and mainly more and more everyday citizens are becoming concerned about the trend in the Federal courts. More and more people are asking why it is that any officials in a democracy should have lifetime tenure.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my remarks and the letter from Chief Justice Arterburn of Indiana be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF JUSTICE,
Indianapolis, Ind., August 22, 1972.
Senator HARRY F. BYRD, JR.,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: There was a time when I did not agree with your proposal that federal judges who have life tenure be subject periodically to a review and examination by the Congress or Senate for continued tenure. I would like for you to know that I have changed my opinion, for what it is worth. It appears to me that more federal judges and particularly members of the Supreme Court of the United States have overstepped the bounds of constitutional law, got into the legislative field, imposing their ideas as to public policy and good legislation on the people of the country.

I refer particularly to acts of the United States Supreme Court in changing the Constitution "as of a certain time" (denying retroactivity) without going through the amending process provided in the Constitution. I think it is a violation of their oath

of office. If the Court is deliberately to do acts of that sort, then it is my feeling that the people of this country should have an opportunity to review their legislative acts the same as we do the members of Congress.

I still think that if a judge would stay within his judicial area there would be no need for such a periodical review, but we have too many men who are judges who feel that they are the repository of all wisdom and that they know what is better for us as individuals than we do.

I feel that in a democratic republic the people should still have the right to determine their own destiny and not be ruled by men with life tenure who are never made accountable for their violation of their oath of office in changing and amending the Constitution without the consent of the people.

I make these remarks in the hope that they will support you in your endeavors to save the basic principles of our Constitution.

With best personal regards.

Very truly yours,

NORMAN F. ARTERBURN,
Chief Justice of Indiana.

A REVIEW OF CONGRESSMAN UDALL'S BOOK, "THE EDUCATION OF A CONGRESSMAN"

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 9, 1972

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I think that many of our colleagues will read with interest the following review in the September 16, 1972, Chillicothe, Ohio, Gazette of the recent book by our able and distinguished colleague, Congressman MORRIS K. UDALL, "The Education of a Congressman."

Author of the review is James A. Eldridge.

Mr. Eldridge's review follows:

THE READING ROOM CONGRESSMAN TEACHES
AS HE LEARNS

(By James A. Eldridge)

The political season is upon us. We have reached that place on the calendar at which every four years the Republic through a unique political process—sometimes ludicrous, sometimes hilarious, sometimes brutally painful—yet always profound process, selects a President, members of the Congress, and a gaggle of state and local officials.

Each time a number of concerned citizens and thoughtful politicians hope that we will debate the issues and that from the debate a better informed electorate will emerge. The historical record shows that more often than not the hope is lost in the winds of oratory. Platforms, pamphlets, position papers, political biographies, editorials, and reprints of speeches pour forth from the presses. Little of it endures.

Therefore, it comes as a pleasant surprise to encounter a new political book that was not written as a campaign document but one that has a relevance to this national campaign and yet a timeless quality for public discussion beyond this particular campaign. It is "The Education of a Congressman" by Morris K. Udall, Democrat of Arizona, and it is published by Bobbs-Merrill.

Congressman Udall, like many of his fellow members of the Congress, keeps his name before the voters back home by sending newsletters on his activities, points of view and voting record. (We in Ohio's Sixth Congressional District frequently hear from Congressman William Harsha as well as Senators Taft and Saxbe.)

In the little more than 10 years that Congressman Udall has served in the House of

Representatives he has sent out over 80 newsletters describing his views on major political and legislative issues. With the editorial assistance of Robert L. Peabody of Johns Hopkins University and the American Political Science Association, the Congressman has selected some 23 newsletters for this book. They cover six topics: foreign affairs; domestic affairs; environment; economics; and political reform.

With deadly accuracy they reflect the trauma of the 1960s. As Professor Peabody points out in his succinct introduction, "The 1960s were many things: an era of the Peace Corps and the Vietnam War, of Lyndon Johnson and Eugene McCarthy, of Spiro Agnew and the Weathermen, of Watts and Woodstock, of the birth of the space age and the death of the SST, of civil rights and women's liberation. Throughout all of these years our citizens experiences much anguish, engaged in not a little trouble introspection, and found themselves in deep disagreement over the aims and goals of American society. The 1960s seem to parallel the vacillation and cleavage that linked the end of the Jackson administration with the opening rumblings of the Civil War."

The reader of "The Education of a Congressman" is soon aware that as Congressman Udall faced all of these issues he was a troubled, thoughtful man—two problems were paramount: Does the U.S. Congress have the vitality, the resiliency and the leadership to meet these challenges? And where do I—Congressman Udall—fit in?

Something of the character and integrity of Congressman Udall comes clear when he writes, "In a very practical way I was immediately confronted with the oldest and most basic question of representative democracy: For whom does a legislator vote? Which do I put first, Arizona or the nation? Do I vote my strongly held convictions or those of a majority of my constituents at that point in time? Am I simply a tabulator of constituent views, then by which poll, which stack of mail, or which editorial does one determine at a given time on which side the 51 per cent falls?"

The Congressman, like many another conscientious politician before him, finds his guidelines in the oft-quoted statement of Edmund Burke to the voters of Bristol, "... your representative owes you not his industry, but his judgment, and he betrays instead of serving you if he sacrifices it to your opinion."

This book is worth its price for an essay that is included—"The Road to Power in Congress: The Education of Mo Udall—and What It Cost" by Larry King, the Congressman's brother-in-law and a onetime member of the editorial staff of Harper's magazine. Larry King is a very funny man. He is to the written word what the late Fred Allen of radio fame was to the spoken word. It is joyous news to hear that he is working on a biography of Lyndon Johnson. It is safe to predict it will be savagely hilarious.

Congressman's Udall's book might well have been called "The Education of a Congressman and the Voters." In this cynical season of national politics restore your faith in representative government and the men it produces by reading "The Education of a Congressman."

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 9, 1972

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks:

"How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,757 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE JACKSON AMENDMENT FOR ALL AMERICANS

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 9, 1972

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct your attention to the closing paragraph of the October 6 New York Times editorial discussing the effects of the recent passage of the Jackson amendment:

Two months ago, as he departed from Moscow, Secretary of Commerce Peterson told the Kremlin that the state of American public opinion would have decisive influence on Moscow-Washington economic agreements. Now a Senate majority has proved Mr. Peterson an excellent prophet. Let the realists in the Kremlin take heed—before it is too late.

The endorsement of this proposal to deny the Soviet Union credits, credit guarantees, or most favored nation treatment so long as the U.S.S.R. requires exorbitant ransoms from Soviet citizens wishing to emigrate was passed, as we all know, by almost three-fourths of the Senate body. This action clearly illustrates to me, and I am certain, to the people of this entire Nation, that the democratic principles and ideals, the beliefs of Locke, Montesquieu and Jefferson so crucial to the foundation on which our country stands, that our firm commitment to the rights of freedom and

justice for all people is as strong and as invincible a force behind our feelings and actions today as in the time when our Constitution and Bill of Rights were first conceived.

Reviewing the background of the successful passage of this amendment cannot help but reinforce the importance of the need for all individuals to speak out for those whose voices are silenced and to take action for those whose actions remain unrecognized. Early last week, the Board of Governors of the National Conference on Soviet Jewry, comprising 35 national agencies and over 200 Jewish communities, representing the overwhelming majority of the Jewish community throughout the United States, convened in Washington, D.C. at an emergency session.

Their purpose—to impress upon our Government their profound anxiety concerning these most recent wrongful measures taken by the Soviet Government decrees that particularly affected Jewish citizens of the U.S.S.R. The resolution read as follows:

We are mindful of the need to make every effort to advance world peace and increase understanding between the American and Soviet peoples. But there can be no true detente at the expense of human rights. By its intimidation of Soviet Jews in flagrant violation of basic human rights, the Soviet Government places obstacles in the path of the detente between East and West which all Americans of good will desire. Opposing these violations is a moral imperative for the American people.

The United States is now considering trade agreements which would give the Soviet Union great tariff concessions and billions of dollars in credits. It is the unanimous opinion of the National Conference on Soviet Jewry that Americans who hold a decent respect for the opinions of mankind will not concur in the cynical proposition that conventional, economic and political interest can be separated from moral considerations.

Efforts are now underway in the Senate to withhold Most Favored Nation Status from the Soviet Union, and to deny grants, loans or credits to the Soviet Union or any other country that denies its citizens the right to emigrate by imposing extortionist charges as the price of immigration. We welcome these efforts and urge all Senators to support them.

I would like to take this opportunity to join my voice with those of the Senate majority yesterday and vote yea for the passage of this most vital amendment.

LEGISLATION INTRODUCED BY CONGRESSMAN CHARLES A. VANIK IN THE 92D CONGRESS

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 9, 1972

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, as we begin to complete another Congress, I feel that I should state for the RECORD some of the principal bills which I have introduced and supported during the past 21 months.

I believe that an examination of all the bills which I have sponsored during the 92d Congress gives a fairly complete picture of my political philosophy, of my priorities in the Congress, and of my hopes for a more compassionate government—a greater America in a better world.

Some of the bills which I introduced were not considered or failed of passage during the 92d Congress. These bills and legislative concepts may be ahead of their times—it is a function of Congress to plan for the future, and I am confident that these bills will be considered in the years ahead and that they will be enacted.

ENVIRONMENT

Date	Short title	House hearings	House passage	Senate hearings	Senate passage	Conference	Law	Notes
H.J. Res. 7..... Jan. 22, 1971	To establish a Joint Committee on the Environment—or in lieu of a Joint Committee, a House Committee.	×	×	×	×	-----	-----	No final action yet on this legislation to provide a coordinated Congressional approach to environmental problems.
H.I. Res. 60..... Jan. 22, 1971								
H.R. 56..... Jan. 22, 1971	To establish a National Environmental Data System.	×	×	×	×	×	-----	Probable final passage.
H.R. 3362..... Feb. 2, 1971	To prohibit interstate sales or shipment of no-deposit, no-return containers.	-----	-----	×	-----	-----	-----	
H.R. 4010..... Feb. 9, 1971	To increase Federal share in grants for construction of waste treatment plants.	×	×	×	×	×	-----	Included in Water Pollution bill. Probable final passage providing significant financial relief to Northeast Ohio.
H.R. 4556..... Feb. 18, 1971	To regulate strip mining.	×	-----	×	-----	-----	-----	Cosponsored with Representative Hechler (West Virginia). Testimony given in support of bill to House Interior Committee. Version pending in Senate and House.
H.R. 5075..... Feb. 25, 1971	To permit citizens' suits against polluters.	×	-----	×	-----	-----	-----	Some citizens suits for water pollution control included in Water Pollution Control bill now pending.
H.J. 6384..... Mar. 18, 1971	Clean Air Amendments of 1971	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	Bill eliminates certain air pollution problems not met by 1970 Clean Air Act.
H.R. 6722..... Mar. 24, 1972	Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments.	×	×	×	×	-----	-----	Concept of Federal Water Quality standards nationwide, as well as increased funding, are basis of present Water Pollution bill now awaiting final passage.
H.R. 6898..... Mar. 29, 1971	To establish Pollution Disaster Fund for severely polluted areas.	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	S. 2770, Public Law 92-399.	Water Pollution Act of 1972 (see above) now pending final passage provides special fund for Lake Erie. In addition, Environmental Protection Agency appropriation bill includes \$108,500,000 for "crash clean-up program" on Great Lakes.
H.R. 7445..... Apr. 7, 1971	To prohibit the introduction or shipping in interstate commerce of any polluting substance.	×	-----	×	×	-----	-----	A version of this legislation which attempts to deal with the problem of the sale of untested new chemical compounds has passed Senate. House hearings have been completed.
H.R. 7673..... Apr. 22, 1971	Ohio Canal and Cuyahoga Valley National Historical Park and Recreation Area.	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	National Park Service currently studying this Northeast Ohio park proposal. Bill cosponsored by 25 others.

Date	Short title	House hearings	House passage	Senate hearings	Senate passage	Conference	Law	Notes
H.R. 8665..... May 24, 1971	Ban on phosphate detergents.							
H.R. 9495..... June 29, 1971	To prohibit SST flights over United States until sonic boom issues resolved.			X	X			Environmental questions were among the reasons for the termination of the U.S. SST program. Until these questions are answered, foreign made SST's should be prohibited from U.S. skies.
H.R. 9764..... July 13, 1971	To permit Federal Water Pollution Control grants to be used for separation of storm and sanitary sewers.							Cost to Cleveland, alone, of such sewer separation is estimated at over a quarter billion dollars.
H.R. 9681..... July 8, 1971	To amend 1899 Army Corps of Engineers permit system to coordinate authority with EPA and provide penalties for violations.							Provisions generally included in Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments; final passage pending.
H.R. 9684..... July 8, 1971								
H.R. 10100..... July 27, 1971	Require use of re-cycled paper in printing of Congressional Record.							
H.R. 12015..... Dec. 2, 1971	National Oil Recycling Act.							Proposal currently under study by EPA and FTC.
H.R. 15502..... June 14, 1972								Testified before the Senate Public Works Committee in support of bill to aid communities such as Euclid, Willowick, and Eastlake.
H.R. 13689..... Mar. 8, 1972	To provide Federal assistance against shore erosion.			X				Vital that oil shale lands only be developed in environmentally sound manner and that trillions of dollars of oil shale on public lands benefit all the American people.
H.R. 14691..... Apr. 27, 1972	Oil Shale Lands Environmental Act and Mineral Leasing Amendments.							This bill is a stronger version of the Administration sulphur oxide tax proposal.
H.R. 14866..... May 9, 1972								Senate amendment to railroad legislation requires ICC to conduct such a study and take corrective action.
H.R. 15140..... May 23, 1972	Tax on sulphur oxide emissions.							
H. Res. 441..... May 12, 1971	Provision for a study of freight rates that discriminate against recyclable materials.				X			

CRIME CONTROL AND LAW ENFORCEMENT

H.R. 5645..... Mar. 4, 1971	National uniform emergency police telephone number—"911".							
H.R. 4416..... Feb. 17, 1971	Suspend foreign aid to any Nation not cooperating in narcotic drug control.	X	X	X	X	X	Public Law 92-226	
H.R. 6733..... Mar. 24, 1971	To establish a coordinating Drug Abuse Control within the Executive Office of the President.	X	X	X	X	X	Public Law 92-255	Provision incorporated into Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act of 1972.
H.R. 12562..... Jan. 24, 1972	Research on cure, prevention, and treatment of heroin addiction.	X	X	X	X	X	Public Law 92-255	Provision incorporated into Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act of 1972.
H. Res. 886..... Mar. 8, 1972	Termination of Foreign Aid to Thailand due to failure to control drug traffic.	X	X	X	X	X		

CONSUMER LEGISLATION

H.R. 4434..... Feb. 17, 1971	Consumer Protection Act.	X	X	X				A weakened version of this bill has passed the House and is under debate in the Senate. Hearings held before Joint Economic Committee.
H.R. 5186..... Mar. 1, 1971	The consumer and energy costs: 1. Termination of Oil Import Quota program.							Oil Quota program provides no real national security (its stated goal) yet it costs consumers \$7,000,000,000 annually in higher fuel costs.
H.R. 5187..... Mar. 1, 1971	2. Repeal Connally Hot Oil Act.							Hot Oil Act of 1930's permits several oil producing states to maintain an artificially high price of oil at enormous cost to all Americans.
H.R. 5774..... Mar. 9, 1971	3. To provide for a national inventory of mineral deposits.							Legislation needed to provide public with an independent analysis of energy reserves and their pricing. Presently all data is supplied by private sector which is demanding higher gas and fuel rates.
H.R. 7224..... June 17, 1971	4. To establish national defense petroleum reserves.							A petroleum defense reserve would eliminate argument used to maintain Oil Import Quota program which really provides no security but which cost consumer \$7,000,000,000 annually (see above).
H.R. 8417..... May 17, 1971	To require public dating of perishable and semi-perishable foods.							
H.R. 9142..... June 15, 1971	To require labels on all foods to disclose each of their ingredients.	X						
H.R. 13776..... Mar. 13, 1972	Repeal Meat Import Quota Law of 1964.							Rising meat prices require termination of Meat Import Quota. Cosponsored by 48 Members. President suspended quotas for last half of 1972. Permanent repeal needed.

CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS—A RICH NATIONAL HERITAGE

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 9, 1972

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, Christopher Columbus really was the first immigrant, so to speak, who brought with him a crew which was by no means just Italian. His team included

Portuguese, Spaniards, and other adventuresome individualists.

It is, therefore, fitting that Columbus is only one of two persons which our Nation has honored with a national holiday.

Columbus embodies that rich national heritage of the Italians from beautiful operas to magnificent stone work inherited from the Renaissance Tuscans.

Italo-American contributions to our Nation's culture have been far too numerous to list. However, they do range from Enrico Fermi, one of the greatest

physicists in the history of man, to daily contributions in our localities by Italo-American doctors, lawyers, teachers, scientists, artisans—all of whom have made our society the great one that it is.

I join all Americans in celebrating this day in honor of a great and courageous man who symbolizes not only the greatness we inherit from the Italian culture but from the cultures of all nations who have sent their people to become, along with all of us, what we are first and always—proud American citizens.